UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/690,366	10/16/2000	Billy P. Taylor	28150.6	3106

27685	7590	06/17/2004

HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
600 CONGRESS AVENUE
SUITE 1600
AUSTIN, TX 78701

EXAMINER
LUDWIG, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2004

/10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Application No. 09/690,366

Applicant(s)
TAYLOR, BILLY P.

Examiner
Matthew J. Ludwig

Art Unit
2178

Office Action Summary

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _13 August 2002_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1,2,4,-7,9-12,14-30_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1,2,4,-7,9-12,14-30_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _4,5,7,8,9_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Application filed 10/16/00.

2.   Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, and 14-30 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 6, and 11, are

independent claims. Claims 3, 8, and 13 were cancelled in accordance with the Preliminary

Amendment filed 8/13/02.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   **Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Mueller, USPN 6,694,484 filed (6/3/97).

In reference to independent claim 1, Mueller teaches:

The HTML documents utilized within the tag detection methods of Mueller would have

provided a reasonable suggestion of a mass-produced printed paper. The claim limitation, "mass-

produced printed paper", does not preclude the Examiner from using a generic HTML document

as it allows for any form of media to contained within and printed on demand. See column 6,

lines 58-67.

If an association tag is found, then the association module reads the index reference. See

column 6, lines 65-67. The detection methods taught by Mueller provide a proficient means for

detecting a reference at a first location within the HTML document that is association with a

second location. The terms 'detecting a *reference* at a *first location*', (as presently claimed) does

not provide the Examiner with a specific description of the detection methods. Furthermore, the

terms do not preclude the Examiner from using the teachings of Mueller to provide a reasonable

suggestion of a reference and two separate locations.

The detection methods taught by Mueller provide a link between an application program,

a reference tag, and the index reference. Mueller suggest the direct association between the

processes and the means for retrieving information pertinent to a document and displaying the

information. See column 8, lines 36-67.

The reference does not explicitly disclose the formation of a *link*; however, the detection

methods taught by Mueller disclose a means for detecting an association tag and associating the

tag reference with an index reference. The claim language, '*link within the version between the*

first location and the second location' does not preclude the Examiner from utilizing the

associations between the tag and an index reference to suggest a link between two distinct

locations. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the

teachings of Mueller before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the associations

between the application program, the detected tags, the index reference, and included a link to

provide a similar function for allowing the application program, thereby improving the

performance in accessing the stored information.

In reference to dependent claim 2 and 4, Mueller teaches:

If an association tag is found, then the association module reads the index reference. See

column 6, lines 65-67. The detection methods taught by Mueller provide a proficient means for

detecting a reference at a first location within the HTML document that is association with a

second location. The terms 'detecting a *reference* at a *first location*', (as presently claimed) does

not provide the Examiner with a specific description of the detection methods. Furthermore, the

terms do not preclude the Examiner from using the teachings of Mueller to provide a reasonable

suggestion of a reference and two separate locations.

The detection methods taught by Mueller provide a link between an application program,

a reference tag, and the index reference. Mueller suggest the direct association between the

processes and the means for retrieving information pertinent to a document and displaying the

information. See column 8, lines 36-67.

The reference does not explicitly disclose the formation of a *link*; however, the detection

methods taught by Mueller disclose a means for detecting an association tag and associating the

tag reference with an index reference. The claim limitation, '*link within the version between the*

first location and the second location', does not preclude the Examiner from utilizing the

associations between the tag and an index reference to suggest a link between two distinct

locations. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the

teachings of Mueller before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the associations

between the application program, the detected tags, the index reference, and included a link to

provide a similar function for allowing the application program, thereby improving the

performance in accessing the stored information.

In reference to dependent claim 5, Mueller teaches:

If the HTML document is transmitted by a first user to a second user that is remotely

located, an additional association tag specific to the first user may be embedded into the HTML

document. See column 3, lines 55-60.

In reference to claims 6, 7, 9, and 10, the claims reflect the system comprising instructions for performing the detection and linking methods as claimed in claims 1, 2, 4, and 5, respectively, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

In reference to claims 11, 12, 14, and 15, the claims reflect the system comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in claims 1, 2, 4, and 5, respectively, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

5.   **Claims 16-20, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mueller and further in view of Sugimoto et al., USPN 6,678,866 filed (6/30/99).**
In reference to dependent claim 16-20, Mueller teaches:

Relating an HTML document to stored information that is associated with the HTML document and with an application program, wherein the application program retrieves the stored information for use in performing an operation on the HTML document. See column 2, lines 53-65. The reference does not explicitly state the displaying of an advertisement related to an HTML document. Sugimoto discloses label images and establishing link information for linking a network address to that address information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Mueller and Sugimoto before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the tag detection methods taught by Mueller to include the advertising methods of Sugimoto, because it would have provided extended storage of information locally that is document and application specific so that the information does not have to be recomputed for each invocation of the application program.

In reference to dependent claims 21-25, the claims reflect the system comprising instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in 16-20, respectively, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ferrel et al.,   USPN 6,584,480   filed (10/30/00)

In reference to dependent claims 26-30, the claims reflect the system comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in claims 16-20, respectively, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 703-305-8043. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ML
June 9, 2004

STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER